

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claims 1, 10, 18 and 25 are amended.

In the Office Action mailed on February 7, 2006:

Specification was objected to; and

claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

For the reasons set forth in detail below, applicant submits that the present application, including each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Objection to Specification

The Examiner requested amended of the section entitled "CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATION(s)" to reflect the current status and Patent Application Numbers of mentioned applications. This section is up to date and at this time there is no new information to replace the information already in this section.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 1-30

The Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin (US Pat. No. 5,872,783) in view of Rangachar (US Pat. No. 6,301,252). In this response independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 25 are amended.

Independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 25 are directed to transmitting data (frame) to a designated network manager wherein when the destination virtual address of the data is reserved, the data is provided to the designated network manager. These amended independent claims also recite that the network manager is designated prior to receiving the data and prior to determining whether its destination virtual address is reserved or not.

With regard to the primary reference, Chin, the Office Action, on page 3, line 11, states that "each switch acts as an individual and distributed network manager." The Office Action continues to state that when the virtual address does not map to a port of the switch, the frame (data) is flooded to all ports, which inherently transmits the data to the network manager. Therefore, as alluded to by the Examiner, Chin does not discuss designating a network manager before receiving the data at his switches, and does not even have any designated network manager.

The Office Action states that Rangachar teaches a central network manager, which may be combined to improve Chin's network. However, using such central network manager will completely defeat the purpose of Chin's method in which "flooding" replaces the duties of the network manager. In other words, if there were a central network manager in Chin, there would have been no need for Chin to teach "flooding" the ports. Therefore, not only there is no suggestion but also no motivation to combine these references.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires, *inter alia*, a suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings (MPEP 2142).

As described above, the primary reference, Chin, does not disclose the elements of the rejected claims and there is no suggestion or motivation to combine it with Rangachar either. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 25 and, accordingly, the undersigned requests the withdrawal of Section 103 rejection of these claims. The undersigned also requests the allowance of claims 2-9, 11-17, 19-24 and 26-30 which depend from the above mentioned allowable claims 1, 10, 18 and 25 and include the features of these independent claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance and, therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6488.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 030048035US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 6/8/06

Respectfully submitted,

By M. Macartney
Michelle C. Macartney
Registration No.: 55,828
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant